DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 413 95 SP 009 373

AUTHOR Dambruch, Edward L.; And Others
TITLE Governance of Teacher Centers. Special Current Issues Publication No. 2.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 24p.
AVAILABLE FROM SCIPS, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. (1-9 copies, $0.70 ea., 10-99 copies, $0.65 ea., 100-999 copies, $0.60 ea., 1000 or more, $0.55 ea.)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Consortia; Cooperative Planning; Educational Coordination; *Governance; Inservice Teacher Education; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains four papers on teacher center governance, each written from a different perspective, and each dealing with a different aspect of teacher centers. The first paper discusses issues concerning the governance of teacher centers and deals specifically with (a) collaboration, (b) affiliation, and (c) parity. It is written from the perspective of a representative of a federally funded teacher center. The second paper deals with governance from the perspective of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service (AATES), whose teacher center operates through a consortium. The activities of the AATES are traced from its creation in 1945 to its model teacher center program in 1970 to its 1974 feasibility study for the establishment of a teacher center to serve metropolitan Atlanta. The third paper furnishes an example of the kinds of programs which can exist under school-district governance. The history, organization, and projects of the San Francisco Unified School District Teacher Center are described. The fourth paper is a proposal for a teacher center by the Des Moines Education Association Instruction and Professional Development Committee. It is an example of how a teacher center is initially conceived. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110413

SPECIAL
CURRENT
ISSUES
PUBLICATION

No. 2

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Governance of Teacher Centers

SP009 373

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER CENTERS

Edward L. Dambruch
Charles K. Franzén
Richard Meder
and
Des Moines Education Association
Instruction and Professional
Development Committee

Published by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

August 1975

SP 009 373

The Clearinghouse is sponsored by:
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Education Association (NEA) for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the NEA, other Clearinghouse sponsors, or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword. . . . . *iv*

Issues in Teacher Center Governance
Edward L. Dambruch 1

Governance in the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service
Charles K. Franzén 7

What is a Teacher Learning Center?
Richard Meder. 10

Proposal for a Des Moines Teachers' Center
Des Moines Education Association
Instruction and Professional Development Committee 14

FOREWORD

Paul S. Pilcher echoed a question that has literally been heard across America in his January 1974 article for Phi Delta Kappan, "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" This question identifies teacher centers both as a concept important in educational thinking today and a concept that in execution inevitably produces practical problems and logistical concerns regarding a center's purpose, organization, and governance.

The Clearinghouse has approached this SCIP on current issues concerning teacher centers, with special emphasis on governance, in a manner in keeping with the complexities of the issues. Each of the four papers in the SCIP is from a director or representative of a teacher center who is, therefore, something of an authority on the topic. But the papers are each written from a different perspective and deal with a different aspect of teacher centers. We hope through this approach to illustrate some issues concerning teacher centers, as seen by people involved.

The first paper, by Edward L. Dambruch of the Rhode Island Teacher Center Project, discusses issues concerning the governance of teacher centers; specific topics dealt with are collaboration, affiliation, and parity. Dr. Dambruch writes from the perspective of a representative of a federally funded teacher center.

The second paper, by Charles K. Franzén, also deals with governance but from the perspective of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service (AATES), whose teacher center operates through a consortium. Dr. Franzén traces the activities of AATES from its creation in 1945 to its model teacher center program in 1970 to its 1974 feasibility study for the establishment of a teacher center to serve metropolitan Atlanta.

The third paper, by Richard Meder, furnishes an example of the kinds of program which can exist under school-district governance. The history, organization, and projects of the San Francisco Unified School District Teacher Learning Center are described.

The fourth paper presents still another perspective in that it is an actual proposal for a teacher center by the Des Moines Education Association (DMEA) Instruction and Professional Development Committee. In contrast to the other papers which discuss issues or describe programs, this paper serves as a blueprint for a teacher center that does not yet exist; it is an example of how a teacher center is initially conceived. An epilogue describes the current status of this proposed center, which is part of the National Education Association (NEA) pilot center for teacher-centered professional development.

The Clearinghouse is indebted to the authors for providing their time and insight into this very current topic.

Joost Yff, Director

ISSUES IN TEACHER CENTER GOVERNANCE

Edward L. Dambruch
Rhode Island Teacher Center Project

> *Teacher centers function through an appropriate collaboration of people who are from, and may represent, formally or informally: universities, colleges, LEAs, schools, community, educational agencies, teachers.*[1]

Collaboration is the central issue regarding the governance of teacher centers, because it determines the planning, development, and operation of a center.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES SHAPING GOVERNANCE ISSUES

Prior to examining specific issues involved in governance, it is important to examine the environment that shapes the governance structure. This environment forms the contextual framework within which the center develops and its governance structure operates.

Some examples of environmental influences affecting governance issues are the following:

Origin of Development - From what individual, group, agency, or institution does the original idea for development of a teacher center flow? What are the affiliations, related philosophies, goals, etc. of the developing agents? Who are the clientele - in terms of affiliation, roles, and geographic or political boundaries?

Needs - What are the expressed or underlying needs identified which the development of a teacher center will address?

Goals - To what primary end would the development of the teacher center be directed? What changes are sought?

Financing - What is the source of financing? What "strings" are attached to the financing - i.e., how much control does the funding source have over the operation? What are the restrictions or barriers imposed?

SELECTED GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A collaborative relationship within the teacher center concept may be defined as follows: an association of independent agencies, institutions, or organizations which functions through representatives with authority to act within defined parameters for their groups in working together to carry out the common purposes and objectives of the association. Key elements of this definition are also visible in Schmieder and Yarger's typology of teacher centers.[2] These include institutional affiliation, representativeness,

and parity -- concepts reflecting questions of bonds and power. In addition, the concept of collaboration raises to the forefront such related issues as the role a governance board should assume, the building of trust among groups involved, and the retention of loyalty to an affiliate group.

The following sections will deal with various components of the major issues related to collaboration. Each will be reviewed in terms of the nature of the issues of collaboration and the perspective of the Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC) on those issues.

The Question of Bonds

With what major agencies, institutions, or organizations -- if any -- will a teacher center be affiliated? What agencies, institutions, or organizations will participate in the collaborative relationship? The former question refers to external bonds, the latter to internal ones. Both types will shape the direction and operation of a center, hence these questions constitute a focal point for critical decisions to be made in establishing the governance framework.

The Affiliation Issue

Unless totally independent, teacher centers tend to become affiliated with one or more established agencies, institutions, or organizations. Such groups include teacher associations, institutions of higher education, and local and state education agencies.

With affiliation come supports and benefits, such as the following: *credibility* through liaison with established institutions, *human resources expertise* and *technical assistance* from collaborating institutional personnel, and *clientele linkage* by means of established communication channels. Benefits will vary, depending on the specific affiliations established.

With affiliation come constraints -- subservience of the teacher center governance board to the policy-setting board of the affiliated institution; ties of allegiance to that institution with concomitant loss of autonomy; required focus, in varying degrees, on concerns, priorities, and goals of the affiliated institution; and required sensitivity to political issues and pressures central to the affiliated institution. The question becomes: How do the scales balance?

In light of the above, each teacher center must weigh both sides of the issue in relation to if and how it chooses to be affiliated with one or more institutions. The response to that issue will undoubtedly have a major influence on governance and total operation.

How RITC Dealt with Affiliation

The Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC) developed along the path of a dual institutional affiliation, funded through an institution of higher education, the University of Rhode Island, and administered through

the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE). Its strongest affiliation, however, lies with RIDE in that RITC is housed in the same office as RIDE, draws upon some of its resources, and has been integrated organizationally with some of the bureaus in that Department.

Benefits accrued from RITC's affiliations with the University of Rhode Island and RIDE far outweigh the disadvantages. The RIDE linkage system, the development of which was significantly influenced by RITC, served as the major communications mechanism for the Center. Consultant resources from both higher education state institutions and RIDE also supported the teacher center operation in various ways.

The impact of constraints imposed on the teacher center because of the affiliative relationship has been minimal. One limitation resulting from that relationship, however, relates to the potential role of the RITC Board of Directors. Whereas the potential roles for teacher center governance boards are policy-setting, advisory, or administrative, the policy role for an affiliated teacher center tends to be eliminated, restricted, or modified. In the case of RITC, the policy-setting function was subsumed under the Rhode Island Board of Regents for Education, and the RITC Board of Directors assumed an advisory role.

The Representation Issue

The concept of representativeness is reflected in two dimensions. The first refers to institutional or group representation, such as teachers, teacher organizations, institutions of higher education, state departments of education, or the community. At the second dimension, specific role representation within groups must be considered. For example, if an institution of higher education is to be a member of the collaborative effort, will representation reflect administrators, teacher educators, or students (preservice and/or inservice)?

Related factors are a) conflicting loyalties, and b) trust building. The first problem often emerges in the light of reality as the representative recognizes the inseparable link to her or his affiliated institution. The inherent competitiveness of the first situation, and the collaboration necessary for building the second, often lead to conflict. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the process of governance *is* the building of a collaborative relationship!

How RITC Dealt with Collaboration

Collaboration within RITC lies at what might be considered the high/favorable end of the continuum in terms of the extent of representativeness of its governance structure. Included on its governing board are the following groups or institutions: teacher organizations (both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT)); institutions of higher education (both major four year public institutions of higher

education in the state and private institutions of higher education); local education agencies (represented at two administrative levels -- superintendents and principals); RIDE, represented by the Bureau of Federal Grants and Regulations and the Bureau of Technical Assistance (the two major links of RIDE to Rhode Island educators); and the community. The level of collaboration in terms of representation is extensive, reaching all major organizations and institutions within the state and including a wide range of role representations extending from administrators to teachers to community.

It was considered politically imperative that RITC invite the aforementioned groups to participate in a consortium-type effort for setting the direction in which RITC should go and the primary vehicles through which it should operate. With that structure, a collective wisdom and greater sensitivity to the needs, concerns, and demands of Rhode Island educators were created, and with that structure a solid, long-range base of support for RITC operations has been established. With that structure also came the private agendas and individual group or institutional priorities or biases. Such differences, however, often contributed positively to growth, direction, and shaping of RITC, with a relatively trusting relationship developing along the way. Overall, the collaborative nature of the relationship appears favorable and healthy, indeed one of the greatest strengths of the operation.

The Question of Power

Who will control? How will power, thus responsibility, be shared? What are the implications of a parity-based relationship? Source, distribution, and maintenance of power are explicitly tied to governance and implicitly tied to collaboration. In the latter case, the central issue is parity.

The Parity Issue

Webster defines parity as "the quality or state of being equal or equivalent."[3] Interpretation of this definition as applied to organizations, in this case teacher centers, may need clarification.

Assuming the adoption of a collaborative relationship as the basis for the governance structure, equality of representation must first be decided and "equal" must be defined. The "one person one vote" concept may be applied reflecting the same numerical representation, or proportional representation of the groups involved may be the choice. In the former situation, each group represented in the collaborative effort has the same voice as every other member group of the collaborative. In the latter case, the amount of voice a member group has is apportioned based on the size of the group represented. Each approach has built-in strengths and weaknesses. Both, however, share the common strength of securing input from all groups represented.

Establishing parity also requires that "equal" be decided in terms of institutional or role representation on the governing board. Either each

member institution (i.e., institutions of higher education, teacher organizations, state education agencies) or each role (i.e., administrators, teachers, teacher educators) will be equally represented.

Finally, it should be noted that a collaborative governance structure based on a parity relationship emphasizes the importance of a cooperative working relationship. Polarization and power blocks tend to be minimized with the inherent stress on decision-making by consensus, which is imposed in a parity relationship. However, consistent with the parity concept, the majority decision prevails in the event of an impasse.

How RITC Dealt with Parity

RITC, as a collaborative organizational structure, stresses a parity relationship in decision-making through its Board of Directors. Equality is defined numerically in terms of role rather than institutional representation, with an equal representation of teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and community persons. Institutional or association representation is also reflected in the following breakdown:

ROLE REPRESENTATION	NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES	INSTITUTION OR ASSOCIATION REPRESENTED
Teachers	1	Rhode Island Federation of Teachers
	1	R. I. Education Association
	1	Afro-Education Association
Administrators	1	Local Education Agency (principal)
	1	Local Education Agency (superintendent)
	1	State Education Agency
Teacher Educators	1	State University
	1	State College
	1	Private Institutions of Higher Ed.
Community	1	R. I. Educational Conference Board
	1	Diocesan Dept. of Community Affairs
	1	Community Service Agency

The philosophy of parity has been operationalized and maintained within the RITC governance structure. The Board handles each concern as it arises, soliciting input on the matter from all partners in the process. In the large majority of instances, the Board has arrived at mutually satisfactory decisions based upon consensus.

NOTES

1. Madison Judson, "Teacher Centers," Journal of Teacher Education 25, No. 1 (Spring 1974): p. 44.

2. Allen A. Schmieder and Samuel J. Yarger, "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America," Journal of Teacher Education 25, No. 1 (Spring 1974): p. 5.

3. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967) p. 613.

GOVERNANCE IN THE ATLANTA AREA TEACHER EDUCATION SERVICE

Charles K. Frauzén
The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service

The Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service (AATES) was created in 1945 through cooperative efforts of two universities and six public school systems. It was felt that a consortium was the best means of responding to the continuing educational needs of teachers. Today, seven public and private universities and twelve public and private school systems are active members of AATES.* Of some 50,000 school-teachers and administrators in Georgia, approximately 17,000 are located in the Atlanta area, and have access to AATES programs. (Since 1970, five other regional area teacher education services have been organized in Georgia, based on the AATES model.)

ORGANIZATION OF AATES

AATES operates under a constitution and bylaws approved by the president of each member institution and the superintendent of each participating school system. Two representatives of each organization form the policy-making Board of Advisers. The Executive Committee, comprised of one representative from each organization, implements programs and procedures. The central office staff is made up of a coordinator, administrative assistant, and two secretaries, all housed on the campus of Emory University. The staff is responsible for implementing program activities.

Governance of AATES has been a university-school process since 1945. Over the years, however, organizational leadership has shifted from university to school personnel. At present, college programs are increasingly designed to meet specific needs of school personnel. Needs assessment is conducted in each school system by a survey of teachers and administrators. Personnel requests indicate group and individual preferences for credit and noncredit courses, and suggestions for times and places for offering the courses. This information is compiled by the AATES staff and relayed to university representatives, after which faculty members are assigned to meet as many of the requests as possible. The AATES staff then coordinates cross-crediting of the courses by the various institutions, as well as class locations and registration procedures.

---

*The universities are: Atlanta University, Emory University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, Mercer University, The University of Georgia, and West Georgia College. The school systems are: Atlanta Public Schools, Cathofic Archdiocese of Atlanta, Clayton County Schools, Cobb County Schools, Decatur City Schools, DeKalb County Schools, Fulton County Schools, Georgia Association of Independent Schools, Gwinnett County Schools, Marietta Public Schools, Newton County Schools, and Rockdale County Schools.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER PROGRAM

One activity sponsored by AATES is the teacher education center program, which began in 1970. In April 1969, some professional educators in the metropolitan Atlanta area had voiced dissatisfaction over student teaching procedures. These educators, representing eight public school systems, nine colleges, and the Georgia State Department of Education, held a series of conferences to clarify their concerns and devise a plan to improve the situation. The group became the Metro-Atlanta Committee on Teacher Education Centers (M-ACTEC). The Committee developed a teacher education center model which was first implemented in spring 1970. The model prescribed a cluster of schools where laboratory experiences could be provided for student teachers. The experiences included team teaching, open education, modular scheduling, computerized instruction, and nongraded classes. Student teachers from various universities were assigned to a center, rather than to one teacher in one school. The center coordinator supervised the student teachers and arranged laboratory experiences with differentiated staff in accord with the model program and the student teacher's needs. The center coordinators at present are university faculty members assigned full-time to the four Atlanta area centers.

Compared with dual-organization student teaching programs involving one university and one school system, governance of a multiple-organization center involves more complex issues. However, because of the initial inclusion of all Atlanta area education agencies, the teacher education center project has developed as a child of all. Educators who had early reservations about the feasibility of the idea have subsequently implemented the scheme into their own systems. The plan has evolved as a local product rather than from a design imposed from a distant source.

Another activity sponsored by AATES dates from early 1974. The Executive Committee established a committee of teachers to study the feasibility of establishing a teacher center to serve metropolitan Atlanta. The committee based its investigation on the idea of a teacher center as a place where teachers' individual needs could be met, whether their needs were professional growth, personal development, sharing of ideas, or experimenting with materials. During the summer, a committee of five teachers from five of the eleven school systems reviewed the literature on teacher centers and visited centers in Boston, Greenwich, New Haven, New Orleans, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C. The committee planned its own mode of operation and shared its findings with the central office staff.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ATLANTA AREA TEACHER CENTER

In August, the committee recommended to the Executive Committee that a teacher center be established. The committee presented a rationale for developing the center, an outline of the center philosophy, a list of planned activities, and a proposed budget. The Executive Committee expanded the committee of teachers to include representation from all 11 school systems and asked that the plan for the center be further developed to

include professional personnel needed, a prospective location, and a plan for governance of the center program. During the school year 1974-75, the 11-person committee met monthly, and by June 1975 had completed the tasks assigned. All that remained was to select a center director and open the center the following September.

The governance of the Atlanta Area Teacher Center (AATC) is shared by the AATES Executive Committee, which controls finances, and the AATC Board of Directors, which will implement a program based on the needs assessment of all teachers in the Atlanta area. AATES has attempted to create an entity which can be self-governing while functioning within the financial boundaries of the parent organization (AATES). The significant issue of governance in this activity involves a break from tradition in which educational programs have been imposed upon teachers without their participation in the actual decision-making processes. Through the teacher center, teachers now have the opportunity to promote activities which seem most relevant in supplementing college curricula and inservice education.

The primary function of AATES continues to be as a coordinating organization in which university and school-system personnel can pool varying educational philosophies and operating styles to solve problems with resultant mutual benefit. Inevitably, tensions occur when personnel from diverse educational agencies attempt to find a meeting ground. However, when members of the AATES Board of Advisers agree upon common goals and collaborate in attaining them, such tensions can be eased considerably. As the governing board membership increases in diversity, this cooperative spirit extends an ever-widening influence on teaching and teacher education in the Atlanta area.

As AATES is now governed, members of the Board of Advisers and the Executive Committee represent universities and school systems. The Georgia State Department of Education and professional associations have been represented in decision-making in AATES-sponsored activities such as the teacher education center and AATES annual conferences. In the future it will be essential to the continued success of the organization that appropriately representative personnel be included in all program decision-making.

WHAT IS A TEACHER LEARNING CENTER?

Richard Meder
San Francisco Unified School District
Teacher Learning Center

It is no accident that the logo of the San Francisco Unified School District Teacher Learning Center (TLC) suggests the collateral meaning of "tender loving care." TLC is an agency of the Instructional Support Services Division of the District, which operates with District funding.* Underlying its philosophy and services design is a strong concern for fundamental human feelings and drives. Indeed, the Center came into being in response to an urgent plea for help in implementing desegregation.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

In the late 1960s, when the San Francisco schools began court-ordered desegregation of the elementary division with a pilot program in the neighborhood just north of Golden Gate Park, a committee of teachers and administrators was formed to handle staff development. The committee of the whole delegated its duties to a smaller, less unwieldy, group of four--a supervisor and three teachers. The supervisor's background was elementary teaching and administration. The teachers represented strengths in, respectively, early childhood and primary sensory development, intermediate math and manipulative skills, and language development and self-concept growth. Although somewhat overwhelmed with the ever-increasing magnitude of their task, they plunged into the chilly waters of trial and error.

The teachers who this small band sought to serve were not averse to help. But they found themselves faced with such a diversity of new problems that they were hard-pressed to articulate what they needed most. Sample questions were: "How do I work successfully with such tremendous ethnic differences?," "How can I possibly teach the basic 'tool' subjects to a group whose range of abilities and interests seems as vast as the total population?," and "How can I work with a group of children who have had no previous common experiences?"

Hearteningly, the *reasons* for desegregation were not questioned. The teachers were committed to implementation. This, in itself, was a giant boost to the morale of the newly formed committee for staff development.

ORGANIZING THE OPEN WORKSHOP

It was evident that there was no single answer to some of the questions, and perhaps no answer at all to others, at least at the time. The one request that seemed universal at these beginning stages was for *inexpensive teacher-made*

*Betty McNamara is supervisor of instructional support services at the Center; Pauline Mahon is director of the Instructional Support Services Division.

instructional materials for classroom use. An "open workshop" was set up to prepare materials. The workshop was carried on in the cafeteria of an elementary school one evening a week and on Saturdays. The committee for staff development had discovered early that directly before or after school and during midday breaks were futile times to offer any kind of help. Teachers who took advantage of workshop features found media prototypes to reproduce, together with materials for reproduction and help in accomplishing each task. As they worked, teachers exchanged both problems and ideas. Soon they found that they were adapting some games, puzzles, and devices to fit specific children's problems in their classrooms.

The climate for pure invention soon became so fertile that minicourses were devised to show the many ways that teacher-made media could be used to individualize instruction. Those who had assumed that pacing was the only path to individualization found that it was but one of many ways to accomplish such a goal. The minicourses soon expanded to include record keeping, contracting, and various styles of classroom management--all devised to meet the assessed needs of participating classroom teachers. News of the workshops spread rapidly, and soon an entire wing of the "workshop school" was being used. The fact that both workable ideas and inspiration were available at the Center was a fine selling point to early skeptics, and remains a chief concern of services design at TLC.

EVOLUTION OF SERVICES

Because the pilot program was successful, the entire elementary division was desegregated by 1970. To continue its policy of usefulness combined with serendipity, the staff development committee (now the staff of TLC) sought ways to assure continuous evolution of services. It is still a basic tenet of TLC that imposing services is as bad as imposing a unilaterally developed environment on a classroom. Therefore, input from all TLC users was sought to discover the actual needs of teachers, paraprofessionals, and children. All the features of TLC were designed on the basis of such findings. Those services which have been maintained have undergone many changes as the focus of need has shifted.

THE PHYSICAL PLANT

In 1972, the school district rented 8,000 square feet of space on the second floor of a building in an industrial district, so that TLC would no longer have to impose on the host school. Today TLC has been expanded to 18,000 square feet and houses all but one of the original committee for staff development, plus a science specialist and a teacher with a background in language and creative arts. The facility is also the central-services base for a federally funded oral and written language team, whose work will be discussed later.

TLC contains a large central meeting room, an informal lounge, two classroom-size activity rooms, a teacher-made media center for display of prototypes, a workroom with a variety of typewriters and typefaces, a number of duplicating machines, an audio-visual viewing room, a large lending library of books and kits of all descriptions and levels, a vendors' display

area of educational hardware and software, a food preparation area, a photocopy and laminating room, individual laboratories for each staff member containing all materials pertinent to each one's specialty, offices for secretaries, a small meeting room and office for the resident supervisor, and two storage areas for equipment and consumables. Cassette duplicating services are also available at the Center.

STAFFING

A number of paraprofessionals and part-time student helpers are on hand to help credentialled staff members. Although each member of the staff possesses certain specialties, as mentioned earlier, everyone assumes a posture of generalist. In this way, the interchange among TLC staff has resulted in personal growth for each person, ultimately leading to increased services to district classrooms.

INSERVICE COURSES

A variety of inservice courses taught by staff members or hired consultants is offered throughout the school year. Topics have included cardboard carpentry, early-childhood sensory activities, humanizing the classroom, ethnic diversity's implications for classroom management, an interdisciplinary arts approach to reading comprehension, closed-circuit TV in the classroom, Piagetian theory applied, and speed reading for teachers, as well as a course with the fascinating title, "Suffering Is Optional!"

CHILDREN'S DAY

Apart from staff members working directly in the classroom in whatever roles the resident teacher wishes, perhaps the most popular service which TLC offers has been a monthly feature called Children's Day. This special "day" actually occurs on four consecutive days each month and, like all TLC services, is provided only for those who volunteer to participate. Early in September, a *TLC-a-gram* is sent to all schools in sufficient quantities to assure adequate teacher coverage. This bulletin announces the dates on which Children's Day will be offered during the year, and which months are to be for primary grades (K-3) and which for intermediate (4-6). Those teachers wishing to involve their children and themselves respond, using the tear-off coupon. Teachers are each assigned and notified of a date as close to their first choice as possible. Those filing late are placed on a waiting list. On Thursday prior to the week they are participating, the teachers meet at TLC for a briefing. They have the opportunity then to meet the two other teachers whose children will be combined with theirs, as well as to witness a brief demonstration of each of the six learning activities offered. When Children's Day is in session, each child receives a name tag with two colors designating which two of the six activities s/he will participate in. The teachers are invited to observe all activities and to see their children working in different environments with different classmates. Upon returning to their own classrooms, the children exchange their experiences with one another, reinforcing what they learned in a natural manner. The staff endeavors

to create learning sessions which will suggest a number of spin-off ideas so that the field trip to TLC will generate a whole series of classroom activities. The teacher is asked to complete an assessment form for each activity to aid staff members in evaluating and developing Children's Day learning stations that are both involving and rewarding.

During 1974-75, approximately 90 classrooms of from 25 to 30 children each were served during Children's Days. Their teachers frequently brought their staff paraprofessionals and/or aides--as well as parents--to observe. It has provided a workable way to unite TLC staff with teachers and other workers in the field, not to mention a setting for trying out innovations. Each year the design of Children's Day has been improved. What form it will take in the ensuing year remains to be seen.

GROWTH EXPERIENCES

TLC offers growth experiences of equal quality to teachers, paraprofessionals, and aides. It is assumed that everyone involved with serving children is equally concerned with working to the optimum degree. That assumption has frequently been borne out in reality. The policy of providing quality service to all has proved valuable for all classroom workers. The children have a focused experience rather than a divisive one. In a climate where everyone is a coequal learner, success is far more frequently found than in a hierarchy where someone has to be at the traditional "head" or "foot" of the class.

THE LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Some mention should be made, as previously promised, of the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA) Oral/Written Language Program. Its federally funded staff of six is housed at TLC but operates chiefly in the field. The program was designed in reponse to a citizen's committee request. The request was based on the fear that children who may do careful seatwork, but rarely speak, are missing the main value of a public school education, namely, the opportunity for peer interaction. Teachers frequently do not disturb the withdrawn child because such children do not represent a disturbing element in the class. If this withdrawal is allowed to become a life-style, an impaired self-image and undeveloped social skills, not to mention a lack of self-assurance in speaking, may result. With this problem in mind, a program was devised which is proving to have dramatic results, including an improvement in reading comprehension.

The necessity of placing oral language at the heart of the total curriculum seems obvious, but the instruments used to denote the target population have shown that many children are afraid to speak in a number of situations, and their oral language consequently has been suppressed. The ESAA program seems to successfully create changes in teachers as well as pupils, in situations where teachers have involved their classrooms voluntarily. The enthusiasm of the ESAA staff has increased with involvement in such a richly rewarding project.

PROPOSAL FOR A DES MOINES TEACHERS' CENTER

Des Moines Education Association
*Instruction and Professional Development Committee**

PART I - RATIONALE

I. Unique aspects of the Teachers' Center: (The following aspects are not necessarily unique in themselves, but grouping them together in a single location does create a unique service.)

A. *Noncredit activities.* For example, a craft session.

B. *Nonacademic focus.* Teachers don't have to apologize for wanting to know how to feel more comfortable about sitting on the floor and rapping with students if that is what they want to learn how to do.

C. *Protected atmosphere.* The center will be a safe place to try out new ways of doing things, to experiment without the presence of a supervisor or other person with authority to evaluate.

D. *Variable size of learning groups* (including groups of one), depending on the purpose to be served.

E. *Nonduplication of existing professional development services*, such as classes for university or salary credit, regularly available supervisory services, inservice training mandated by Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs, etc.

F. *Laboratory-type classroom that is "typical"* rather than "ideal," except that it is permanently equipped for videotaping and/or sound recording of teacher and/or student behaviors.

G. *Concentration of nontextbook type curriculum resources*, such as audio-visual equipment, ERIC indexes, or Bicentennial information.

H. *Ready access to needed mechanical aids* (laminating, photo reproduction, etc.)

II. To make these unique characteristics possible, the following conditions must exist:

*Ruth Foster is chairman of this Committee. Tom Reeves, president of the Des Moines Education Association (DMEA), provided the update to the proposal, which was submitted to the Des Moines Board of Education in April 1975.

A. *Activities must be based on a continuing needs assessment* directed specifically toward inservice teaching and involving all teachers. If, for example, high school teachers do not have any interest in the Center, it is probably safer to assume that the needs assessment processes were inadequate, than that secondary teachers have no interest in continuing to improve their teaching skills. A face-to-face small-group needs assessment is probably most effective. The NEA needs assessment survey of March 1974 is not satisfactory for this purpose.

B. *Participation must be voluntary* and include provision for working on released time as well as after hours, depending on availability of Center staff.

C. *Atmosphere is nonthreatening and humanistic.* Smoking is permitted; the office approximates a "living room" environment.

D. *Controlling voice on policy board rests with teachers*, i.e., those who will be the recipients of Center services.

E. *Paid staff manages office.* Tasks include: providing clerical support, serving as secretary to advisory committee, responsibility for mechanics of continuing needs assessment, securing of material and resources requested by teachers, keeping a file on program activities of the Center, maintaining a resource file as mandated by needs assessment.

F. Adequate budget. (omitted here)

III. Program possibilities are as follows:

A. Provision of opportunity, individually or in groups, to explore and try out nontextbook and nonworkbook curriculum materials.

B. Provision of opportunity, individually or in groups, to create curriculum materials (e.g., individually-guided education (IGE) learning packages).

C. Sponsoring of short-term (one, two, or three all-day) laboratory-type workshops on topics identified by needs assessment. For example, individualized instruction on teaching chemistry, etc. Workshops are to be taught by teachers from elementary, intermediate, and secondary levels of the school system, who have been given advanced training in workshop methods. This training would provide another service of the Teachers' Center.

D. Consultation with university personnel, community-resource personnel (artists, writers, etc.), and school supervisors on problems identified by teachers.

E. Support of minigrants to teachers for approved projects.

F. In the Teachers' Center workshops (see III.C above), one objective would be to have teachers learn more about the learning situation by becoming students and having to analyze learning from the student perspective.

PART II - A PROPOSAL

A. That the Board of Education undertake to establish, in a suitably located school building or other facility, an inservice education center of at least three or four classroom spaces for teachers which would make possible the program activities suggested in Part I.

B. That a Teachers' Center Policy Board of eleven professionals be established: six practicing teachers (two elementary, two intermediate, two secondary) and five others (one building principal from each level, the director of professional development, and one other). The teacher members should be appointed by DMEA, nonteacher members by the Des Moines Superintendent of Schools. This would not conflict with the existing Professional Development Advisory Group of Des Moines Schools Staff Development (the local school board), but would instead represent an additional phase of its program.

C. That the Teachers' Center Policy Board be given authority to (a) employ a Center facilitator and one clerical employee; (b) hire, as necessary, technical advisors; (c) undertake a continuing teacher-needs assessment; and (d) recommend to the Superintendent policies stating the types of activities and the approval procedures under which teachers will be granted released time and/or minigrants. Once criteria have been agreed upon for the above four items, the Teachers' Center Policy Board should have final approval of all activity proposals submitted to it. A budget of $XXX should be allocated to the Center, divided generally as follows:

$XXX	Renovation and equipment
$XXX	Salaries
$XXX	Supplies
$XXX	Technical advisors, if necessary
$XXX	Development (minigrants for developmental programs)

Note: no cost items are shown in this draft. It is our opinion that many of the expenses indicated are already ongoing costs that could be reallocated.

Following your May 20th Board of Education meeting, we would like to be advised of your disposition of this proposal.

POSSIBLE FUNDING SOURCES

The intention, to the extent possible, is to tie into and coordinate with other professional development programs. We specifically suggest that:

1. Inservice funds be sought from either the State of Iowa or the U.S. Office of Education for school desegregation, to be applied toward the Teachers' Center concept.

2. Area Education Agency (AEA) state special education funds for staff development be applied toward Center activities, and that a fee be charged for teachers served from outside the district.

3. Funds presently allocated for the local school-district educational consultants training program be reviewed as a possible source of Teachers' Center funds.

4. Consideration be given to (a) reallocating the number of system-wide released-time days presently used for all-day inservice training institutes, and (b) rescheduling of these days on a voluntary, individualized basis.

5. That the workshop staff (Item III.C of the proposal) be "rewarded" (assuming they are given a released-time assignment to the Teachers' Center) not in terms of honoraria but through opportunities and funding for special training, participation in state and national conferences, etc.

PART III - EPILOGUE

Since this proposal was written, it has been included in DMEA's Master Contract, which will be negotiated starting August 20.

DMEA has conducted an inservice workshop for about 20 teachers who volunteered. This course was conducted under the auspices of Columbia University and entailed the use of videotape recorder (VTR) to tape and critique each teacher's teaching. The course will be offered this fall with members of the original class as teachers. This course will be the beginning of DMEA's teacher-centered inservice program.

SPECIAL CURRENT ISSUES PUBLICATIONS (SCIPS)

ORDER FORM

SCIP #2 GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER CENTERS. Dambruch, Franzén, Meder, and Des Moines Education Association Instruction and Professional Development Committee.
Prices (including postage): 1-9 copies @$.70 each; 10-99 copies @$.65 each; 100-999 copies @$.60 each; 1000+ copies @$.55 each.

ALSO AVAILABLE:

SCIP #1 ACCREDITATION ISSUES IN TEACHER EDUCATION. Young, Cyphert and Zimpher, Proffitt, Knispel, and Sinandle.
Prices (including postage): 1-9 copies @$.50 each; 10-99 copies @$.45 each; 100-999 copies @$.40 each; 1000+ copies @$.35 each.

For further information contact John Waters, User Services, at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Tel. (202) 293-7280.

QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	COST

[ ] payment enclosed TOTAL COST_____

[ ] purchase order enclosed

Please make checks or money orders payable to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Payment or an official purchase order must accompany your order.

Please print the following information:

NAME_____ PHONE_____

ADDRESS_____

_____

_____ ZIP_____

Ordering Address: SCIPS
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
SUITE 616, ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

To separate order form, cut along dotted line.